

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/19/2007.

Claims 1-3, 21-33, and 38-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 26, and 38 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/19/2007, Claims 1 and 26 were amended and claims 38-40 were added as new. This action is made Final.

Foreign Priority

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, **a certified** English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Furthermore, rule § 1.55 (a)(3) states

The Office may require that the claim for priority and the certified copy of the foreign application be filed earlier than provided in paragraphs (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this section:

- (i) When the application becomes involved in an interference (see § 41.202 of this title),
- (ii) When necessary to overcome the date of a reference relied upon by the examiner, or
- (iii) When deemed necessary by the examiner.

(4)

(i) An English language translation of a non-English language foreign application is not required except:

(A) When the application is involved in an interference (see § 41.202 of this title),

(B) When necessary to overcome the date of a reference relied upon by the examiner, or

(C) When specifically required by the examiner.

(ii) **If an English language translation is required, it must be filed together with a statement that the translation of the certified copy is accurate.**

The Applicant has not provided a certified translation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 21-33, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 2004/0119740) in view of Smith (US 6792448).

In regards to claim 1, Chang teaches a processor-implemented document display system, comprising:

means for extracting a relationship between a plurality of documents in a group of documents (i.e. *"The thread detection module 240 is configured to categorize the received electronic message into an appropriate thread. For example, the received message may be part of a thread which relates to choosing a time among multiple people to play hockey. In other embodiments, various subjects may be discussed and comprise a thread"* Paragraph [0032]);

virtual document generation means for: (See Figure 8, Element 810)

selecting the relationship, the group of documents associated with the relationship, and an expansion condition for each document of the group of documents (i.e. *"A symbol 830 represents a suppressed message(s). The suppressed message(s) are available for viewing in response to a request and are hidden to allow a condensed viewing of the plurality of messages 820, 835, and 850)." Paragraph [0069], Paragraph [0036] and Figure 8, Element 810);*

forming a section group that includes the group of documents selected according to the relationship (Figure 8, Element 810);

generating a virtual document from the group of documents (i.e. *“The display module 210 is configured to format the received electronic message based on instructions from the control module 250. In one embodiment, the control module 250 instructs the display module 210 to generate the displayed electronic message. The displayed electronic message may include content of the received electronic message with selected portions elided in response to header module 220, the repeated text module 230, the signature module 260, and/or the elision module 270. In one embodiment, the display module 210 is configured to generate a plurality of displayed electronic messages which correspond to a plurality of received electronic messages.”* Paragraph [0036], Paragraph [0069], and Figure 8).

Chang does not specifically teach identifying an association between the documents in a thread in the virtual document, as a tree structure; and selectively realizing the expansion condition of the thread in the virtual document, based on the tree structure. Smith teaches, identifying an association between the documents in a thread in the virtual document, as a tree structure (See Figure 3, Element 42, the conversation is formed into a tree structure); and selectively realizing the expansion condition of the thread in the virtual document, based on the tree structure (See Figure 3, Elements 43, 80, 82, 84, and 86, the user is able to either expand or contract any branch of the tree regardless of the content.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Chang with the teachings of Smith and include a method to present a document as a tree structure and provide the user with the ability to expand or contract any portion of the tree with the motivation to

provide the user a more robust messaging system where the user is easily able to follow the thread of the conversation and quickly remove any information that is superfluous.

In regards to claim 2, Chang-Smith teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein the virtual document generation means forms the section group by embedding a document header and a level indicating a depth of hierarchy from a main document (See Chang Figure 8).

In regards to claim 3, Chang-Smith teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein the related information storage means stores information of a parent document related to the document read from a document storage means (i.e. *"The thread detection module 240 is configured to categorize the received electronic message into an appropriate thread. For example, the received message may be part of a thread which relates to choosing a time among multiple people to play hockey."* Chang Paragraph [0032]).

In regards to claim 21, Chang-Smith teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein the extracted relationship comprises a hierarchical relationship (i.e. *"The thread detection module 240 is configured to categorize the received electronic message into an appropriate thread. For example, the received message may be part of a thread which relates to choosing a time among multiple people to play hockey."* Chang Paragraph [0032] and Figure 8).

In regards to claim 22, Chang-Smith teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the extracted relationship comprises a thread; and wherein the group of

documents form a message (i.e. *“The thread detection module 240 is configured to categorize the received electronic message into an appropriate thread. For example, the received message may be part of a thread which relates to choosing a time among multiple people to play hockey.”* Chang Paragraph [0032] and Figure 8).

In regards to claim 23, Chang-Smith teaches the system according to claim 22, further comprising an expansion condition storage unit for storing an expansion condition of the message, wherein the virtual document generation unit generates a section by fetching an expansion condition of the message from the expansion condition storage unit (*“A symbol 830 represents a suppressed message(s). The suppressed message(s) are available for viewing in response to a request and are hidden to allow a condensed viewing of the plurality of messages 820, 835, and 850.”* Chang Paragraph [0069]).

In regards to claim 24, Chang-Smith teaches the system according to claim 23, further comprising a user interactive processing unit for accepting an expansion request to a header from a user, wherein the virtual document generation unit is used to add the message to the virtual document on the basis of the expansion request accepted by the user interactive processing unit (*“The elision module 270 is configured to selectively suppress a portion of the received electronic message. In one embodiment, the elision module 270 suppresses the repeated text, the header information, and/or the signature information in response to the repeated text module 230, the header module 220, and the signature module 260, respectively. In one*

embodiment, the elision module 270 selectively suppresses portion(s) of the received electronic message in response to the control module 250.” Chang Paragraph [0034]).

In regards to claim 25, Chang-Smith teaches the system according to claim 23, wherein the documents in the messages comprise a collection of documents that are unscheduled for editing (See Chang Figure 8, none of the messages are scheduled for editing, they are all received messages).

Claims 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 are similar in scope to claims 1, 2, 3, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 respectively; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 38-40 are similar in scope to claims 1, 23, and 24 respectively; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the Applicant's argument that Chang is not valid prior art, the Examiner respectfully points out that the Applicant has not perfected his foreign priority on which he is relying on. Prior to the submission of the amendment dated 10/19/2007, the Applicant called the Examiner who informed the Applicant that he must perfect the foreign priority by sending in a certified translation. However, it appears that the Applicant only sent in a computer translated copy of the foreign document without a certification. Until the foreign priority is perfected, the Applicant can not rely on the foreign priority date.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

/David A Wiley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174